

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Christopher Lane,)	Civil Action No.: 0:23-cv-01284-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
John Palmer, <i>Warden</i> ; First Name)	
Unknown Tierry, <i>Major</i> ; First Name)	
Unknown Moss, <i>Shift Captain</i> ; Jane Doe,)	
<i>Sgt</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”)¹ of United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, who recommends denying Plaintiff Christopher Lane’s motion for preliminary injunction. *See* ECF Nos. 20 & 54.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.² In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for

¹ The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.).

² Objections were due by December 27, 2023. *See* ECF Nos. 54 & 55; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C); Holiday Order of C.J. Harwell signed September 29, 2023, and filed on October 2, 2023

adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 54] and **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction [ECF No. 20].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
January 8, 2024

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge